

Re Box No. V

IAP11 Rec'd PCT/PTO 17 JUL 2006

V.1 Prior art

In the present opinion, reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE 101 43 326 A

D2: US 2001/0040056 A

D3: US 2002/0021136 A

V.2 Novelty and inventive step

The present application fulfills the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty and inventive step (Articles 33(2,3) PCT).

Document D1 discloses a circuit arrangement according to the preamble of claim 1, cf. figure 1, having resistance elements (2) and connections. The provided parallel circuit of a first and a second additional resistance element also emerges from document D1, cf. the arrangement in figure 1. However, connecting each of the additional resistance elements between an additional measuring connection and the first or second measuring connection of the first measuring circuit does not emerge from document D1.

Document D2 discloses a similar arrangement. Here too a plurality of resistance elements connected in parallel ($8_{3,1}$, $8_{3,2}$...) is provided; see figures 5, 7. Measurement can be performed between two measuring connections (20, 22; 36, 38). The arrangement provided in the application, i.e. two further measuring circuits each having a measuring connection in common with the first measuring circuit, likewise does not emerge from document D2.

From document D3 there emerges a matrix arrangement constructed on a different basis than the claimed circuit arrangement.

From the present prior art a person skilled in the art could not derive any instruction to provide two further measuring circuits having the first or second measuring connection of the first measuring circuit respectively.

The object of claim 1 is therefore novel and founded on an inventive step. The subclaims refer to further embodiments and developments. Due to their prior references they likewise fulfill the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty and inventive step.

V.3 Industrial applicability

The object of claims 1 to 4 appears to fulfill the requirements of Article 33(4) PCT, since it can at least be used in the automotive industry.

V.4 Remarks

The two-part form of the main claim 1 (rule 6.3b) PCT) does not appear correct compared to documents D1 and D2. In opposition to the requirements of rule 5.1 a) ii) PCT the description makes no reference to the relevant disclosed prior art in documents D1 and D2 nor to the said documents themselves.